



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/550,283	09/22/2005	Jocrg Dchdc	3430	1891
7590 Striker Striker & Stenby 103 East Neck Road Huntington, NY 11743		06/29/2007	EXAMINER MORGAN, EILEEN P	
			ART UNIT 3723	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 06/29/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/550,283	DEHDE, JOERG
	Examiner Eileen P. Morgan	Art Unit 3723

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 April 2007.  
 2a) This action is **FINAL**.                            2b) This action is non-final.  
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1,2 and 4-17 is/are pending in the application.  
 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
 6) Claim(s) 1,2,4-17 is/are rejected.  
 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
     Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
     Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
 a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:  
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
     Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
     Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_  
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application  
 6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## DETAILED ACTION

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 6, 13 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 6, what does 'elements' refer to? All the elements? Which elements in particular? What are 'some regions'? The term 'element' is too broad and indefinite and not clearly defining the limitation. Claim 13, 'diameter' is in reference to the cross-sectional area? This is unclear since the openings have not been defined as being circular. Also, how does an opening have a rib? The rib has not been defined.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1,2,4-11, 14,15,16,17 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kasabian-3,840,762, alone.

Kasabian discloses a power tool (20) having a housing (22) with a coolant duct/plate (112) having round openings covering entire plate for a cooling medium to enter and cool motor, the duct consisting of a plate attached to housing (22), wherein at

least one element (34) has rounded edges, wherein the openings are located in rows and columns separated by ribs of equal width. Kasabian does not disclose the exact diameter or depth of the openings. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at time invention was made to form the openings within the claimed range of 0.15-10mm<sup>2</sup> since it has been held where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, discovering optimum or workable ranges involves only routine skill in the art. *In re Aller*, 105 USPQ 233.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 12 ,13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kasabian in view of Potter et al.-6,296,427.

Kasabian teaches the invention as detailed above, but does not show groupings of openings with different diameters (or cross sections). However, Potter teaches a hand powered tool having cooling means comprising openings combined in groups (62,64) having openings of varying cross section. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at time invention was made to provide Kasabian with spaced groupings of openings, as shown by Potter, since both arrangements appear to work equally well for cooling a motor and would be within the level of ordinary skill in the art.

***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments filed 4-11-07 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In response to 112 arguments, the term 'element' is still unclear. There are numerous 'elements' inside the tool and therefore this term is too broad, not clearly defining a specific element. In regard to claim 13, the openings are described as having a cross section but not claimed as round. This is unclear. Although the spec describes them as round, the claim has not clearly recited them to be round. Applicant argues on pages 11-12 that the plate of openings is separate and replaceable. These are not claimed limitations and therefore, these arguments are not germane to the claim language. The claim calls for a plate having openings that is joined to housing. Although screen 112 may be mounted by several components, this still anticipates that the holes are located in a plate and joined to housing. The filter screen indeed reads on a 'plate' as broadly claimed. The 'ease of replacement' of Applicant's 'plate' is not germane to Applicant's claimed subject matter. Besides the filter screen 112 of Kasabian can be replaced, and the 'ease of replacement' is relative. In regard to Potter, Examiner relies on Potter to show openings in groups and varying cross-sections. The fact the openings are not in a plate is moot since this limitation is shown in Kasabian.

***Conclusion***

**THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Eileen P. Morgan whose telephone number is 571.272.4488. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday, 7am-3:30pm EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph Hail can be reached on 571.272.4485. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

EM  
June 13, 2007

/Eileen P. Morgan/  
Primary Examiner, AU 3723